

abstract is similar to the PCT abstract, but revised to comply better with US requirements.

In section 2, the Examiner noted the suggested guidelines for US applications. However, as these guidelines are not mandatory, no revision of the specification is required.

In section 4, the Examiner cites US Patent No. 6,074,312 (Lyon *et al.*) against the novelty of claims 1 to 14, 17, 20 to 29 and 31 to 43. The Examiner contends that Lyon discloses all the features of these claims and refers, in particular, to the abstract and figures 3 and 4.

However, the disclosure of Lyon teaches the use of a local processing unit in place of what the present applicant refers to as a data input means. That is, the present invention advantageously reduces the computational demand placed on the remote unit by transmitting data to the central data collection means. Only there is the data actually processed. Claim 1, lines 11-13 of the present application defines that:

progress data may be entered by a person into any of said data input means and wherein progress data so entered is transmitted to said data collection means...

It is clear from the disclosure that "progress data" comprises, in the golf example, progressive score information such as the number of strokes for a particular hole. The system of Lyon, instead, transmits processed data.

Further, Lyon at column 10 lines 7 to 12 teaches merely that:

Periodically, such as at the end of each day, the information entered into LPU 10 will be sent over the Internet to state and national golf associations so that duplicate records may be maintained for the associations as well. In the event that the golfer has played at an away course, the information will be sent via the Internet to the golfer's home course.

There is no disclosure, therefore, of the transmitting at each hole (again, in the golf example) of "progress data". Rather, Lyon merely teaches the downloading of accumulated data "periodically".

Still more significantly, there is no disclosure or teaching in Lyon that "each of said data input means [is] provided with data indicative of its location" or that "said data indicative of said respective location of said respective data collection means" is transmitted (with said progress data) to the data collection means. Rather, at column 9 lines 26 to 33, Lyon teaches that:

Following selection of the appropriate course, a tee selection window 52 is displayed as illustrated in FIG. 11. Touching the appropriate tee, the golfer is able to select which tees were played from for the appropriate round of golf. The golfer is then able to select which holes were played as illustrated in hole selection screen 54 of FIG. 12. For example, the golfer may select whether all 18 holes were played or whether only the front or back 9 were played.

That is, in Lyon the player must inform the system what holes were played and to which hole a particular score relates.

The features discussed above by reference to claim 1 of the present application are also defined in independent claims 17, 30 and 31. According, it is respectively submitted that independent claims 1, 17, 30 and 31 and claims depending therefrom are novel and unobvious over the disclosure of Lyon *et al.*

In paragraph 5, the Examiner cites US Patent No. 5,283,733 (Colley) against the novelty of claims 1 to 5, 13, 14, 16 to 22, 29 to 38 and 41 to 43. The Examiner contends that Colley discloses all the features of these claims and, in addition, wireless communication means.

Colley, however, does not disclose the use of a central data collection means, but rather a plurality of networked terminals. Thus, the system of Colley allows scoring in golf to be conducted electronically, and provides a mechanism for those scores to be accessible to each player at each hole, but it does not actually comprise a data collection system as taught, and defined, in the present claims.

Further, as defined in, for example, claim 8 and claims depending therefrom (and in particular claim 13) of the present application, the present invention teaches a system with, in parallel with the core data collection system, a data card so that a player can carry a record of his or her game around, for example, the golf course. This approach, where redundancy is provided by the storage of scores centrally and on the person of each player, is not disclosed or taught by Colley (or indeed by Lyon).

Further, Colley teaches a system that requires the provision of both fixed terminals and portable data entry devices, and would entail considerable expense. The present invention as claimed in the independent claims eliminates such duplication of expensive hardware. In addition, in preferred forms the present invention nevertheless provides the security of data duplication by means of data cards.

According, it is respectively submitted that independent claims 1, 17, 30 and 31 and claims depending therefrom (especially those specifically noted above) are novel and unobvious over the disclosure of Colley.

In paragraph 6, the Examiner cites US Patent No. 5,127,044 (Bonito) against the novelty of claims 1 to 14, 17, 20 to 29 and 39 to 43. The disclosure of Bonito, however, is similar to that of Lyon in that the player must enter details of his or her location (see figure 6B and column 5 lines 19 to 27). Further, data from a portable device is only

transferred to any form of central data collection device at the end of play - there is no transmission of "progress data" to such a central location (as discussed above). Indeed, data is only transferred to any form of central location by transporting portable devices to that location, and what might be said to constitute a central data collection system appears instead merely to comprise an apparatus for printing an individual's score or displaying each player's score at the end of play (see column 7 lines 13 to 25).

According, it is respectively submitted that independent claims 1, 17, 30 and 31 and claims depending therefrom are novel and unobvious over the disclosure of Bonito.

Finally, in paragraph 8, the Examiner contends that claim 15 lacks an inventive step in the light of Lyon or Colley or Bonito. It is submitted, however, that claim 15 is novel and inventive by virtue of its dependence on at least claim 1, and that additionally there is no teaching or disclosure in the cited prior art - or on the basis of common general knowledge - of the provision of a proximity sensor in the manner defined in claim 15. The Examiner refers to the use of such sensors in, for example, public locations and grocery stores. However, these are provided in order to operate a door or the like. The purpose of the proximity sensor of claim 15 is not to prompt some immediate function, but rather to "awaken" the system and ready it for use. It is submitted that the provision of such a sensor for this purpose, and in this context, is inventive over the cited documents, so that claim 15 is additionally allowable for this reason.

The remaining references which were cited but not applied have been reviewed but are not believed to be pertinent to the patentability of the present invention.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and such action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 5, 2001

By: Douglas E. Jackson  
Douglas E. Jackson  
Registration No. 28,518

LARSON & TAYLOR  
Transpotomac Plaza  
1199 North Fairfax Street, Suite 900  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 739-4900